

Attendance of the April 17, 2002 GMAC Meeting
(based on sign-in sheet)

Name	Agency
Amos, Jeff	Don Breazeale & Associates
Balmir, Sandra	Federal Highway Administration
Brenzle, Bob	BNSF Railway
Brown, Hon. Art	City of Buena Park
Calix, Robert	LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Carpenter, Jeff	City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
Cartwright, Kerry	Port of Long Beach
Cheng, Luke	LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Cuevas, Armando	City of Los Angeles
Daniels, Hon. Gene	City of Paramount
Dorland, Kanya	Port of Los Angeles
Finnegan, Steve	Automobile Club of So. California
Green, Gary	Caltrans District 8
Hicks, Gill	Gill V. Hicks and Associates, Inc.
Hinchliffe, Doug	Lowe Enterprises
Lai, Sue	Port of Los Angeles
Lau, Charles	Caltrans – District 8
Lee, Francis	Caltrans- District 7
Lively, Robert	California Cartage Company
Maggio, Joe	APL
Morrison, Dustin	CHP – So. Division Special Services
Murphy, Tim	Port of Los Angeles
Neely, Sharon	ACE Construction Authority
Proo, Hon. Beatrice	City of Pico Rivera
Randolph, Stan	Caltrans
Rodriguez, Dilara	Caltrans
Senecal, Patti	California Trucking Association
Shultz, Kim	San Bernardino Associated Governments
West, Dale	Western Riverside Council of Governments
Wilson, Kristen	Caltrans – Corridor Studies
Zeigler, John	Automobile Club of So. California

SCAG Staff

Chang, Ping
Griffin, Mark
Havens, Alan
Ruano, Marco
Wong, Philbert

**GOODS MOVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2002**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Art Brown, City of Buena Park, called the meeting to order at approximately 9:35 a.m. A list of those in attendance is included in the minutes.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1 Approval Items

3.1.1 Approval of the March 20, 2002 Minutes

ACTION: Motion to approve the minutes was accepted and seconded with no objections.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Status Reports:

- SR-60 MIS

SCAG is working to develop a Memorandum of Understanding with Caltrans on the SR-60 MIS.

- I-10 Position Paper

Staff has prepared a response to the I-10 Position paper, which is currently under review by SCAG management. The GMAC may choose to co-sign the letter or issue a separate letter.

- Truck Count Study

This study is continuing, and should be completed by June, 2002.

- Empty Container Study

This study is continuing, and should be completed by June, 2002.

- Railroad Project Management Technical Support
The contract for this project has been signed, and work should begin shortly.
- SANBAG Subregional Freight Movement Truck Access Study RFP
Consultant interviews for this study will occur the week of April 22.

4.2 Presentation on “Freight Villages”

Mr. Joe Maggio, Director, Business Development/Terminals, APL Limited, presented this item.

The intention of this project would be to maximize utilization of existing infrastructure. In order for this project to proceed, all parties involved in the logistics chain, including steamship companies, terminal operators, trucking companies, railroads, warehouse/distribution centers, consignees, and public agencies would need to be involved.

The goals of the plan as presented would be to relieve congestion at the container yard by moving more cargo at off-peak hours, eliminate truck waiting/idle time at the container yards thereby reducing truck fuel consumption, reduce truck traffic during peak periods, and increase productivity at the warehouse/distribution center.

From a public perspective, an inland freight village would provide public benefits by reducing truck traffic during peak periods and improving air quality by reducing truck idle time. A freight village would require cooperation of local cities to allow such a facility to be built, as well as to allow truckers to deliver at night.

According to preliminary cost estimates conducted by APL, a 50 acre site would cost approximately \$8.5 million. Despite the initial costs, APL believes that efficiency increases can offset these costs. For example, working off-peak hours at terminals will create additional costs. On the other hand, throughput efficiencies could be achieved potentially rationalizing costs. Trucking companies could realize fuel savings due to reduced idling and could increase earnings by being able to complete more round trips. Consignees could see cost savings based on closer availability and flexibility to plan distribution. However, they would see an increase in drayage costs due to gate charges at the freight village and local Inland Empire drayage.

An Inland Freight Village would assume a gate charge of \$25 per container, and would include three days of free time. After the three days, storage would be \$50 per day. Using these amounts, the facility could show a profit by the 4th year.

Consignees would face an increase in costs of between \$60-125 per container. It has not been determined whether or not these additional costs can be justified by increases in supply chain efficiency.

Mr. Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, noted that the freight village concept of draying containers to a storage facility, then transporting the container to the consignee, is included as part of the goods movement alternative of the I-710 Corridor Study.

Mr. Robert Calix, LACMTA, proposed that a study be conducted on the feasibility of an inland freight village.

Ms. Patty Senecal, Transport Express, believes that if an inland freight village is established, shippers would be willing to extend their hours of operation if the village is open 24 hours a day.

Hon. Bea Proo, Councilmember, City of Pico Rivera, stated that from the local city perspective, the project must be beneficial for both the city and its residents, and for goods movement. Chair Brown added that cities could benefit not only through sales taxes but also job creation.

Mr. Bob Brenzle, BNSF Railway, stated that currently, short-haul rail is not cost competitive with trucking. Furthermore, BNSF does not have sufficient capacity to handle short-haul loads because it takes away space from long-haul rail.

Mr. Mark Griffin, SCAG, noted that many of the projects in next year's budget deal with aspects that an inland freight village study would cover, such as truck lanes, rail capacity, and intermodal facilities.

Chair Brown made a motion that the inland freight village concept be presented at the June TCC meeting, and that additional funding be sought to study elements of a freight village. The motion was approved by consensus by the committee.

5.0 **COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no comments.

6.0 **NEXT MEETING**

The next regular GMAC meeting will be:
Wednesday, May 15, 2002

9:30a.m. – 11:30a.m.
SCAG Offices, San Bernardino Conference Rooms A&B

7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20am.